

42

742

G. R., S. 58]

Previous references.

File No. 71-13

915.6
Pol 73-13 (1-9) (Notice)

Serial Nos. 1-12

Later references.

Pol 71-13 (1-12)

Pol 378-28.
Pol Dep 387-32

may be
preserved
Am
S. 122

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-12

Part B for

July
Aug. 15

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the order of the S.M.
of Mysore S.D. declining to grant license
to one Nanjundaiah of Kiranulli village
in the Honour M. to conduct marriage
processions.

12) To The Regt., Chf. C.

J. 227. of 20.7.15

Returns the records received
the S. N. 7.

h. g. h. m.
20/8/15.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Police)

NOTES.

File No. 71-13

FILE HEADING.

Appeal against the order of the D.C. Raipet, Raipore D.C. declining to grant license to one Nanjundaschari of Kirsamalli village in the Huzur Th. to conduct marriage processions.

From

Nanjundaschari of Kirsamalli village

No.

Dated 15-9-13

Received 16-9-13

Diary No. J957

Enclos. 2

Spare Copies.

Serial No. /

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the order of the D.C. Raipet declining to grant line license to conduct marriage processions.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subd. for orders calling for

ms
1/20/9
a report
P.A.
(47) 179139/11
18

2) Issue
18/9

NOTES—First Sheet.

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. 71 of 1913-14

Serial
No.

2. do. The Dt. Magte of Mysore no. J 1052 of 23.9.13
Forwards the above for a report
3. From The Same Office no. 268 of 27.9.13
States that the report will be subd.
after the records are received from the Chief Court
3) Subd. the records of the case may be awaited.

W.V. (110)
12.11.13SB (48)
12/11/13

4) Yes

Spd
12/11Sus
13/11/13

4. From The Dt. Magte. no 613 of 5.3.14
Forwards records in of ~~miscellaneous~~
appeal no 68 of 1912-13 on his file and states that
his order explains in detail the facts of the case
and that the records of the 1st class Magte. have
been called for and will be sent on receipt.

5. From The Same Office. no. 626 of 2.3.14
Forwards the records in Criminal
Miscellaneous case no. 9 of 1912-13 on the
file of the Adst. Commr & 1st class Magte. Mysore

Sub. Division.

Pat. of 19.12.14 from Nandamuni (a r. magte.)

The facts of the case are:-

- 5) Nanjundachari, a goldsmith
of the Hiranalli village in the Hunsur
Taluk, applied for a license
to the Adst. Magte. for a license

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. 71 of 1913/14

Serial
No.

celebrate the marriage of his brother & Co.)
 to take marriage processions in the village streets.
 But Chikareproda and others of the village
 objected to the grant of the license on the ground
 that the celebration ^{in the village} of Golo Smith's marriage
 was opposed to established usage. The Amilsar
 Mafte permitted Nanjundachari to celebrate
 the marriage within the four walls of his
 house but directed that as the counter
 petitioners had established a custom to the
 effect that Golo Smiths should not carry
 processions in the streets of the village, all processions
 should be dispensed with. Thereupon Nanjundachari
 appealed to the DC. Mafte who referred
 the case to the Sub Division Mafte, Junpore.
 This officer decided that a license as
 desired by Nanjundachari may be
 granted to him. Dissatisfied ^{with} this order
 his opponents again came up to the
 DC. Mafte who, while admitting the
 right of the Golo Smiths to celebrate
 marriage & go in procession, ~~was not~~
~~so~~ declined ~~to~~ on grounds of expediency
 to go further than the Amilsar Mafte's
 order. Then the matter went up
 before the Chief Court. But that
 Court following the decision in 18th Mys
 C.C.R. 1 held that it had no jurisdiction.

(4)

Serial
No.

ction in the matter and dismissed the revision petition. Nanjundasachari has now come up to Court.

6) Subd. for orders with references.

B4.
67/13-15

7). I remember there were some cases recently in which the question of jurisdiction of Court to decide such questions was considered. Please put up the references.

67/14

8) Subd. Police File no 172-13

containing the required references is linked hereto.

B4.
67/14-15

9) The facts of the case have been stated in paragraph 5. The only question for consideration in this case is whether the Panchalas to which community the petitioner belongs, are not entitled to conduct marriage processions in the streets of the village of Kinnelli in Hunsur Taluk. The Amildar refused to grant a license on the ground that a custom having the force of law has been established to the effect that the Goldsmiths should not ~~conduct~~ ^{conduct} any marriage processions in the streets of Kinnelli. The Sub-Division Magistrate to whom the appeal against the order of the Amildar has been referred by the District Magistrate held that in the particular circumstances the custom

Pl. 16/1

Serial
No.

was not proved and that it was also unreasonable and opposed to public policy. On appeal (?) the District Magistrate held that the right of the goldsmiths to be in possession could not be denied but that it was not expedient and ^{to the prejudice of} that it was not possible to support that right against the prejudice of others.

(10) Apart from the question of procedure adopted in this case, it is a point for consideration whether the order of the District Magistrate can be supported.

(11) The law on the subject has been stated very clearly in a number of places. In *Muthiah Chellu v. Bapum Sait* 2 Madras 40, it was held that the right was a natural right inherent in every person.

"It is a right recognised by law that persons may, for lawful purpose, whether civil or religious, use a common highway by parading it attended by music so that they do not obstruct the use of it by other persons." The fact that the right was not being exercised at any time before, does not prevent the petitioners from exercising it, as it is a natural right. (Mys. Ch. Ct. R. 35) as observed by Justice Krishna Rao in this case, "no custom is required to support their natural right." Further it was held by Sir Charles Jinnah in a Madras case (reported at p. 89 in *Weir's Law of Offences B.I. II*) that a custom founded on religious intolerance can not be recognised.

(t)

Serial
No.

(12) The reasons assigned by the District Magistrate for refusing the license do not appear absurd. It does not allege that there was or is any likelihood of a breach of the peace. "A magistrate has no general authority to declare the law on the subject and anticipate a breach of it by a prohibitory order."

(13) It is a point for order whether the Government may interfere in this case.

8
29.1.14

Just member)

(14) It is hard to prohibit processions in Mexico. But an unqualified brushing aside of such sentimental objections might occasionally lead to trouble.

(15) Please let me know all the cases referred to in the 10th of the report.

(16) Also all the documents that may be of use here, both in the 10th

Serial
No.

Indl depts

5/2/15

H. M. S.

S. G. M.

(17)

Subd. with a draft to the Rep.
Ch. Ct. Calling for the required records. After
its issue this may be sent to the Muzrai
Br. for putting up precedents that may be
available there.

88-
19-2-15
J. M.

(18) Same

S. G. M.

6 To the Registrar, Civil Court. no. 72884

22-2-1915

Calls for the required records.

(19)

Subd. This may now be
sent to the Muzrai Branch for putting
up precedents as ordered by the 1st. Member

88-
22-2-15
J. M.

S. G. M.

Per VII

(20)

There are no precedents about marriage
processions in the Muzrai Branch.

Have copies of certain orders

regarding processions of deities are
put up for reference. G.O. no. 5096-1034
of 5.5.06 lays down the principles

Mis Reg. no. 26.
VII 14.15

71X

1) 720. 5096-1034 8.5.08
2) " 3922 8.13.08
3) " 912-3 8.28.08
4) " 186-7 8.10.11.08

NOTE - Contn. sheet.

Serial
No.

reached finding the conduct of such
processions, and seen to form cases
of the kind now under notice.

Sub-? to under sec? 10

2/3/15

2) Forwarded to Br III

he
6/3/15

Pol
12/3

7 From The Registrar, Chief Court. No. 3907-266

2/26.2.15

Forward the records called for.

22) The files regarding meetings

processions available in Br III have
been traced & put up. The records were
called for at the instance of the
1st Member. Subd. for orders.

2/26.2.15

7 to V, M, S

Pol 97-11-2

Pol 236-11-3

- 193-13-2

T

B.

23) Both Mr. Wallace, and Mr. P. S. Krishna
Rao have expressed their views on the subject.
Mr. P. S. Krishna Rao has discussed and stated
his law in criminal R.P 103 709.10. He has
reiterated the same opinion in Cr. R.P 134 709.10.
He had no jurisdiction to pass the orders in these
cases as he admitted in the subsequent cases.
But his opinion is entitled to great weight.
The dictum of Mr. Wallace in the

K

Serial
No.

Recent case Cr RP 20 of 12-13, seems to be
a correct statement of the law practice on this
question.

24) In the light of the views of the judges,
it seems expedient to support the order of the District
Magistrate of Mysore.

Es
30/4

Dis. Member

Flagged-

[Where are the papers relating to
file? Original P. & C. J. & C.]
H. -
29/30/6

25) The Pub^l cannot be precluded
from carrying on a marriage-
procession for ever. It may
be advisable in exceptional cases
to prohibit such exhibitions in
particular places or for short
periods. Ask the Dist Mag^r
to report whether arrange-
ments cannot be made either
by a local Panahayle in the

2852

10

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. 71 of 1913-16

Serial
No.

village, or by an exercise
of authority (if necessary)
to allow the processions to
take place ~~in~~ within the
villages with such safeguards
& restrictions as may be
necessary.

[Signature]

6/7/15

26) (P.C. may be informed
of this also)

recd. 8/7

27) Put up draft

8/7

28) Subd. with two drafts.

29) Issue
8/7/15

Pol
sh

Sur 14

184.
9.7.15

8 To The St. Maff. Inq. St. no. J142 of 12.7.15

Enquire whether arrangements
cannot be made either by a purchase of
the village or by an exercise of authority
(if necessary) to allow the marriage processions
to take place within the village with such
safeguarded restrictions as may be
necessary.

Serial
No.

9

To The Petitioner. no. T143 D/12-7-15

Intimates that the matter
is still under correspondence.

10

From The D.C. Mysore, Mysore D.C. no. 37 D/12-7-15

States that an amicable
settlement by panchayat will be tried &
that if this should fail the necessary
arrangements will, as desired by Govt., be
made for the marriage procession
taking place in the village.

30) Subd. with two drafts.

Bt-
16-7-15. NK

31) Issue

Es -

17.7

11.

To. Kanyindachari Mro Mr B.T. Ramaswami
chetty Advocate, Bangalore.
No. 225 D/20-7-15.Intimates that Mr. D. Magte, Mysore will
arrange to have the procession referred to by him conducted.

To Mr. D. Magte, Mysore No. 226 D/20-7-15.

Forwards two copies of the above.

12

To The Registrar, Chief Court

No. 227 D/20-7-15.

Returns the records received with H.7.

P. 1/10/14

10/10/14

10/10/14

15/10/14

(12)

DIARY No. 7959

10/3-10/14
SECTION P. 111
FILE NO. 71-13
SERIAL NO. 1

B. 111

10/10/14

The Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
His appeal No. — of 1913-14.

The humble petitioner of Nanjunda Chary
alias Nanjundappa residing in Krimahally
Hunasur Taluk, Mysore District respectfully
sheweth as follows:—

That in order to celebrate in
the petitioner's village the marriage of
Srikantiah petitioner's brother the petitioner
applied to the Amildar of Hunasur Taluk
(His Petition No. 2 of 1911-12) for license to
bring Ganga (Sacred water) in procession
from outside his village, take the bridegroom
in procession to his house and to take
the bridal pair in procession in the
Village Streets. On this Sunne Gowda,
Liddle Gowda, Lingai Gowda and Chennai
Gowda of the petitioner's Village unjustly
opposed the petitioner's application on the
ground that Panchangas had never
celebrated marriages in the village.

The Amildar while recognizing
the petitioner's right to perform the
marriage in his house inconsistently
refused to grant the license to conduct

13)

the marriage processions on the bare ground that it is not proved that Panchanas had hitherto performed such rites in the village

The Assistant and First Class Magistrate, Mysore Division in territorial mis: case No: 9 of 1912-13 granted the license to the petitioner and provided for the safe carrying out of his order. But the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate of Mysore in mis: appeal No: 6 of 1912-13 has after admitting petitioner's right to conduct marriage processions in the village cancelled the license on the bare ground that the said other residents of the petitioner's village are objecting to the performance of a Panchana marriage in the village and that their sentimental feelings must be respected. He has wrongly held that the bringing of the Ganga (Sacred water) in procession from outside the village the bridegroom's procession and the procession of the bridal pair are not necessary adjuncts to a Panchana marriage. The petitioner was ordered to confine the performance of

of the marriage rites to the precincts of his house.

The petitioner humbly submits that without performing the said rites it is impossible for him to celebrate the marriage.

The petitioner and other Panchanas in the Mysore Province are the loyal Subjects of His Highness the Maharaja and look for protection to Government and the Government Officers against unjust sentimental opposition of people of other Castes. In exactly a similar case Mr. Lehandy as Deputy Commissioner of Mysore District ordered the grant of ~~license for the~~ conduct of such procession.

There is absolutely no reason to refuse giving protection to persons whose rights are recognized. The strong arms of Government are able to overcome the idle sentimental opposition of ignorant and superstitious people.

The petitioner most humbly prays that the Government may be graciously pleased to call for the record and after kindly perusing the same and hearing the petitioner may be pleased to cancel the order of the Deputy Commissioner and

TWO ANNAS

MYSORE

COURT

1913

1913

Encl to the
District

71-13-1

In the Court of

Magistrate of Mysore

This 12th day of July 1913

Present:- A. Subramanya Iyer Esquire B.A. District Magistrate

Criminal No. appeal no. 6 of 1912-13

Appellants. Saunegowda and others of

Kiruvalli village

Respondent:- Nanjunda Chari

This is a petition presented by

The appellants praying that no license

may be granted to the respondent

for the performance of the marriage

of his brother in the Kiruvalli

village of the Periyapattur Hobli, Mysore

Dahuk as it is against the

prevalent custom of the village

17)

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ



Order (2)

Petitioners ^{Mr} and Counter - petitioner present. Mr. Srikanthiah
 for petitioners and Mr. Lakshmanarao for
 Counter-petitioner heard.
 This is an appeal from the
 order of the Assistant Commissioner and
 First class Magistrate Mysore Division granting
 a license to petitioner a goldsmith
 to celebrate a marriage and have
 procession also. The Taluk Magistrate granted
 a license for performance of the
 ceremonies in the Counter-petitioner's house.
 This did not satisfy Counter-petitioner
 He appealed to the District Magistrate
 who referred the matter
 First class Magistrate of the Sub-
 Division for disposal. The First class

29

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS



ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

(3)

Magistrate has as mentioned above given
a license for marriage and procession
also.

No elaborate arguments about natural and
inherent rights is necessary. No enlightened
person can deny the right of
goldsmiths to celebrate marriages and conduct
processions also; but the ingrained sentiments
of others are against such processions
and marriages. In many places in
this District it is the belief
of some people that the celebration
of goldsmiths marriages in the village
ruins the village. Of course it
would be hard to say that
no marriages should be celebrated but

2/

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS



ಎರಡು ಅನ್ನಾ

(4-1)

previous ⁱⁿ the may for the present
 be well dispensed with as they
 may infuriate the opposite party and
 are not essential adjuncts to a
 marriage. I must again say that
 I do not deny the right
 of goldsmiths to go in process
 I mean that it is not
 expedient and may not be possible
 to support that right against the
 prejudices of others.
 The Taluk Magistrate seems to have
 considered all these matters, in deciding
 that the marriage ceremonies should be
 confined to what can be done
 in the house without any sort

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the
Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by	

TWO ANNAS



ಎರಡು ಆಣಾ


(5)

of processions for any purpose 2
are not at present prepared to
go further.

12/7/1913.

Signed/ A. Subramanya Iyer

District Magistrate



copy

By order

Mr. J. M. A. Williams
Judicial Head Clerk

25)

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the
7/8/1913	-	-	-	7/8/1913
Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by	
7/8/1913	7/8/1913	Shamane	Abdurrahim	

12.24.22 9-9-23
15-9-23
594

126

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ಮಹೋದಯ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಶಂಕರ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್.

1913 - 1914 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ನಂಬರು.

ಪ್ರಾಧಿ.

ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿ.

ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ
ಶಂಖಂಕಾರಾಶ್ವಮೇಧ

ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ
1. ಶಂಖಂಕಾರಾಶ್ವಮೇಧ
2. ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ
3. ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ
4. ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ

ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ - ಮು|| ರಾ|| 12-9-22 12-9-23 ವರಿಗೆ.

ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧಾಶ್ವಮೇಧ ಬರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತನಾಮ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾನು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ
ಫೈನಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ,
ಆರ್ಟ್ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು ತಿಬ್ಬು ಮೊಬಲಗು
ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ
ಸ್ವಾಂಪು ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್‌ಸ್ವಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತು ವಿಷಯ ದಸ್ತೆ
ವೆಡು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿ
ಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾನು ನಡೆಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು
ನಡೆಸಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧ ನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 15-9-1913

ರುಜು

ಶಂಖಂಕಾರಾಶ್ವಮೇಧ
ಶಂಖಂಕಾರಾಶ್ವಮೇಧ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ
ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ
ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುವದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ತಿಫೈ
ಮಾಡಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯ ಆಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ
ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ಮಹೋದಯ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಶಂಕರ್

1919

Calling for report -
re the grant of *File no 71-13*
a license to one *Sl. no. 2*
Nanjundachari
GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
to conduct marriage
processions.
GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT (27)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. J 1052

The accompanying Petition Registered
No. J 959 dated 15.9.13
received at the General and Revenue
Secretariat from *Nanjundachari*
of Hunsur village
in the Hunsur Taluk
re the grant of a license
to conduct marriage
processions

is forwarded, together with its enclosures,
to the *Pl. Magt. of the*
Mysore Dt.
for *early*
report with the records
of the case.

By Order,
[Signature]
for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
23.9.1913

[P. T. O.]

B.G.
(49) 17.9.13
Korke

[Signature]

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.....ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ

.....ಪೋಷಕ

.....ಗಾಂವಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಚಾರ್ಸ್ ಪುಕ್ಕು.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗುರುತಾಯಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ.....

ಮಧ್ಯಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.....ವಿಧ್ಯೆ

.....

.....ವರ ಬಳಿ. ಕಳೆಯುವೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order.

Secretary.

29

268

DIARY No. 8/123

10/3-10/14
SECTION Police
71-13
CL. 3

Office of the District Magistrate

Mysore dated 27th Sept. 13.

From

A. Subramanya Iyer, Esquire, B. A.

District Magistrate of Mysore.

To

K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esquire, M. A.

Secretary to Government

Genl and Rev. Departments.

Sir

With reference to your O.M. No. J 1052-Pol. 71-13-2 dated 23rd inst. calling for a report upon the petition of one Nanjundachari of Tirunalli village appealing against my order regarding the grant of a license to conduct marriage procession, I have the honor to state that the records in mis.appeal No. 6 of 12-13 with those of the 1st class Magistrate's court Mysore Division have been forwarded to the Registrar, Chief Court in response to his docket No. 908/470 dated 28.8.13 calling for the same. On return of the above records, they will be submitted.

I have the honor to be

sir

your most obedient servant

A. Subramanya Iyer

District Magistrate of

Mysore.

ms

A.C.

From P. L. 191 221 (2)
Am at maghe copy
2/9

To Secretary to Govt
22/2/1913
B'lore

Dated

Despatched 21.9.13

Received

General No. 268
No.

Enclosure No. nil

Stating that marriage
procurator license records
of Nanjundachari of Tirumalai
village has been sent to
the chief agent

From *9/3* *whelp* *9/3* (30)
the district magistrates
my son district

To

the Secretary to Government
Genl. *18/15*

Dated

5

3.14

Despatched

7

Received

General No. *613*
No.

Enclosure No. *1/12*

*Submitted to Records connected
with the appeal petition
of Mangana Chai of
Immanelli —*

Office of District Magistrate
Mysore District

1110 J 2839

1013-1014

Dated Mysore $\frac{5^{th}}{7}$ March 1914

SECTION 71-13

FILE NO. 71-13

SERIAL NO. 4

From

A. Subrahmanya Iyer, Esquire, B.A.,

District Magistrate, Mysore District

To

K. R. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Esquire, M.A.,

Secretary to the Government of H. H. The
Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments

Sir,

With reference to your official memo
no J 1052/pol 71-13-2 dated 23rd September
1913 calling for report upon the petition
of one Nanjundaiah of Tirunelli Village,
speaking against my order refusing the
grant of a license to conduct marriage
procession, I have the honor to submit
herewith the records of Miscellaneous
appeal case no 6 of 12-13 on my file
and to state that my order explains in

(32)
detail the facts of the case. The records
of the First class Magistrate's Court
have been called for and shall be sent
on receipt.

The petition received with your memo
under reply is also submitted herewith.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

G. V. Krishnakumar
Assistant Commissioner
For District Magistrate
2nd Mysore District
(Absent from Station)

III
From 14/3 191

133

The District Magistrate
by me

To

The Secretary to Government
Genl & Res Dept

Dated 9 . 3 . 14
Despatched 11

Received

General No. 626.
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file.

Sub mit's records connected
with the grant of a license
to Nanyandachari of
Tirumalli village —

Diary No. of letter replied to

204

No. 72834.

General and Revenue Secretariat

()
, the 191 . }To The Registrar, Chief Court
of Mysore.

Date of issue 22.2.1915.

Sir,

Signed by

M. G. Greeniswara

I am directed to request
you to be so good as to forward
for reference the records of the
marginally* noted cases in
the file of the Chief Court.

- Criminal Revision*
Petition
1. Criminal Revision
Petition no 7/1912-13
 2. Criminal Revision
Petition no 103 of 1909-10
 3. Criminal Revision Petition
no 134 of 1909-10
 4. Criminal Revision
Case no 57 of 1910-11
 5. Criminal Revision Petition
no. 52 of 1907-08.

I have &c.

E. G. R. S.
For SecularB. G.
19.2.15

W. R.

over.

SUBJECT.

3907
266 10/11/13
2/13
(36)
Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore, dated 26th February 1915.

27 March

From

N.T. Gopaliengar, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,

Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E .

To

D.M. Narasinga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Offg: Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

J 2822
19141515
SECTION: Police
FILE No. 71-13
7

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. J2834/Police 71-13-6 dated 22nd Instant, I am directed to forward the records of the marginally noted cases on the file of this Court and to request that the same may be returned when no longer required.

1. Cr1:Rev:Petn:No: 20 of 1912-13.
- 2..... 403 of 1909-10.
- 3..... 134 of 1909-10.
- 4..... 52 of 1907-08.
- 5 Cr1:Rev:Case No. 57 of 1910-11.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. Gopaliengar

R E G I S T R A R .

M.S.L.

1" 97
G. R. S. 26]

X

2 drafts

(37)

Police

File No. 71-13

Serial No. 8

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 9142.

General and Revenue Secretariat
()
, the 191 .

To

The Lt. Master Mysore Dist.

Date of issue 12/7/1915.

Correspondence ending with

Signed by Mr. G. Sreenivasa Iyer
at No. 5

his letter no. 626 dated the 9th

March 1914 regarding the grant
of a license to one Nanjundappa
of Hirunalli village in the
Hunsur Tal. to conduct a marriage
procession.

As late as

With reference to the
above has the honor to enquire
whether arrangements cannot be
over.

SUBJECT.

38)

made either ~~either~~ by a ~~board~~ *pradhyak*
in the village or by an exercise of
authority (if necessary) to allow the
processions to take
place within the village with such
safeguards & restrictions as may
be necessary

By Order
B. G. J.
For Secretary

Plt. Secy
9/1/13 H. K.

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

97

4

~~2 drafts~~

file no 7/13

sl. no. 9

(39)

Memorandum 143.

With reference to
 no 1 his petition dated the 15th
 September 1913 regarding
 the grant of ~~expression~~
 a license to conduct a
 marriage procession &
 reminds that ~~Naupada~~
 Naupada of ~~Kaimalli~~
 village in the Hunsur
 It is informed that
 the matter is still under
 correspondence.

Date of issue. 12. 7. 1915.
 Signed by M. G. Sreenivasa Jy.

By Order
 G.
 9.7
 for Secretary.

B.G.
 9.7.15. W.K.

Office of the District Magistrate,
Mysore District.

Dated, Mysore, 13th July 1915.

DIARY No. 9121.

10/5-10/6
From Police
FILE No. 71-13A. Subramanya Iyer, Esquire., B.A..
SERIAL No. 10

District Magistrate,
Mysore District.

To

D.M. Narasinga Rao, Esquire., B.A., B.L.,

Offg. Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments,

Bangalore.


Sir,

With reference to your Docket No. J.142/Police 71-13-8 dated 12th instant re the grant of a license to one Nanjundachari of Kirunalli village in the Hunsur Taluk to conduct a marriage procession, I have the honor to state that an amicable settlement by panchayat will be tried. If this should fail, the needful arrangements will, as desired by Government, be made for the marriage procession taking place in the village.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.



District Magistrate,



Mysore District.

From

11/15/1911
 The Deputy-Commissioner
 Mysore St.

To

The Secretary
 to the Govt of Mysore

Dated

Gen. & Rev. Dept.

Despatched

13. 7. 15.

Received

General No.

No.

17

Enclosure No.

re the grant of a license
 to one Kurejunda chavij of
 Kinnalli village - Mysore
 St.

27/7/15

27/7/15

Police (4)
File no. 71-13
Sl. no. 11

Thro' Mr. B.V. Ramaswami Chetty
Sociati, Bangalore.

Memo No. J 225

In continuation of

this office memo no. J143 - Police 71-13
of dated the 12th July, 1915.

Nanjundachari of Keri nalli

village in. the Mysore

It is informed that

the Dt. Magistrate, Mysore

Dt., will arrange to

have the procession referred

to by him conducted.

Date of issue. 20/7/1915.
Signed by Mr. G. Sreenivasulu.

By Order

17.7.
For Secretary

Memo. No. J 226 of 20th July 1915.
Incl. 2 files. Copy to the Dt. Magistrate,

Mysore Dt., with reference to

the correspondence ending

with his letter no. 37 of 13.7.15.

retaining the records received

with his letters nos. 613 & 626

of 5th & 9th March 1914.

By Order

For Secretary

20/7/15

16.7.15.

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

, the

191

Date of issue

20/7/1915.

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of

Signed by

Mr. G. Venkataswami Iyer

Mysore, Bangalore

Has the honor to return
herewith the record received
with his letter no. 3907-266 of

26.2.1915
2.3

By Order

Mr. P. K. K. K.

18.7.
1915

over.